DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 563 SP 010 747

AUTHOR Timpane, Michael
TITLE Federal Education Programs and Their Effect on Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 30p.; Position paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (29th, March 1-4, 1977, Chicago, Illinois); will be included in AACTE 1977 Yearbook

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Educational Finance; *Educational Planning; Educational Policy; *Educational Trends; *Federal Aid; Federal Programs; *Federal State Relationship; Financial Support; Program Development; Social Change; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This document examines developments in federal elementary and secondary education support programs and suggests ways in which teacher education institutions might respond to future developments in the field. Federal policy enacted in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) promotes five distinct goals: (1) equal educational opportunity; (2) educational reform; (3) educational research; (4) employment preparation; and (5) limited general support. While the role of the federal government has remained basically unchanged since, policy debate continues, centering on (1) education's position in national social policy, with an emerging consensus that the federal government should concern itself with economic stabilization, income security, and health insurance, leaving responsibility for educational support mainly to the states and (2) program management in the intergovernmental system, that is, the power positions of the federal and state governments and the local educational areas. Future trends indicate a heavy focus on state level activity involved in retrieving public confidence in the educational system and in managing decline due to shrinking enrollment, with new federal programs focusing on preschoolers, handicapped students, and adults. Implications for teacher training institutions involve: (1) responding to changed demographic factors (shift to inservice education, career preparation components, development of preschool and adult education services); (2) a planning effort to prevent a renewed teacher shortage in the 1980's; (3) concentration on management problems; and (4) cooperation in those programs that the federal government does offer for facility extension and improvement (teacher centers, teacher corps). (MB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED134563

Position Paper

Michael Timpane

29th Annual Meeting

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AACTE/Gail Burdin
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SP010 747

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

COPYRIGHT (c) 1977 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C. 20036. This material will be published later in the 1977 AACTE Annual Meeting Proceedings.

FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND THEIR EFFECT ON TEACHER EDUCATION

by

Michael Timpane
Director
Center for Educational Finance and Governance

The Rand Corporation

March 1977

The views expressed are my own and not those of The Rand Corporation.

FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND THEIR EFFECT ON TEACHER EDUCATION

The colleges of teacher education must be wondering: where are federal education programs going without them? Almost alone among federal education programs, several of those concerning teacher education (namely, the EPDA programs) have been successfully dismantled, and the emerging successors (namely, teacher centers) operate on the theme of "Teachers, train thyselves." It must seem reasonable to the colleges of teacher education that they should have some role to play in carrying forward the new national educational priorities which are often embodied in the federal programs. Reasonable, yes; desirable, yes; inevitable, no.

The purposes of this paper are two: First, to set forth the main lines of development in federal elementary and secondary education programs since 1965. Occasional reference is made to the role which teacher training programs have played therein. Not referred to at all are the federal higher education programs (notably student aid) which also affect the schools and colleges of education. And second, to suggest several ways in which the institutions of teacher preparation might respond to the likely shape of these federal education programs in the future.

I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS*

Federal elementary and secondary education programs have over the past 12 years become a set feature on the national education scene. That they appeared at all was due mostly to a conjunction of demographic, economic, and social forces originating outside the world of education, creating demands for educational change. Political opportunity occurred in 1965 with the Johnson Administration and the 89th Congress, and the ESEA was born. Since 1965, various programs have been added, modified, consolidated, and occasionally dropped, but the shape of the federal role has changed little. Federal dollars for these programs have risen from

*Much of the material in this section is drawn from my "Federal Aid to Education: Prologue and Prospects," Rand Working Note 9741-HEW, January 1977; a paper prepared for the Office of the Assistant Secretary (Education) of HEW.

$2 billion then to $4.6 billion now, but have remained a relatively constant 7-8 percent of total national spending for elementary and secondary education.

Table 1

ESTIMATED FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 1976

Programs	Expenditures ($ millions)	
Aid to Target Groups (excluding set-asides)		
Disadvantaged (Title I and Follow Through)	2,109	
Bilingual	99	
Indian	57	
Handicapped	326	
	2,591	
Other Grants to States and School Districts		
Support and innovation	185	
Libraries and instructional equipment	147	
Impacted areas aid	704	
Vocational and adult education	617	
Emergency school aid	272	
Miscellaneous project grants	109	
	2,034	
Total		$4,625

SOURCE: Education Division, "FY 1977 Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill," August 12, 1976.

Except for impact areas aid and vocational education programs, these programs have begun since the mid-1960s (and both impact areas aid and vocational education have been altered a great deal during this time). Under each heading, one or several grants-in-aid go to state or local governments (for the most part), for some specified federal purpose. Within several of the program areas (such as handicapped, vocational education, and emergency school assistance) and in the Teacher Corps project grants, there are modest programs for teacher training; although EPDA has itself expired. *In toto,*

these training programs amount to little more than $100 million; and their share of the federal expenditures is smaller today than five years ago.

Until the 1960s, the federal government had almost no policy-making role in elementary and secondary education in the United States. The United States Office of Education collected statistics, a few hundred districts received payments to offset the financial impact of nearby federal installations, and very small amounts of money were distributed to the states to further vocational education. But in the year-to-year development of local school policies, the federal government had no role.

The reasons for this were more political than constitutional. The Constitution is silent in the topic of education--which was not even a public function at the time of adoption. Later in the nineteenth century, when public elementary and secondary education began to develop, local government (joined gradually by the states) set all educational policy; the federal government showed little interest in playing a part.

During the past 40 years, of course, the federal government has entered many new realms of social policymaking--in health, welfare, social insurance, employment and unemployment assistance, and in education. These developments were in response to the increasingly complex and interdependent nature of our society and economy, as well as to a growing national legislative and judicial commitment to concepts of equal opportunity and treatment. In education, specifically, the political and economic benefits of a well-educated citizenry became more manifest and more national in character, as geographical mobility increased and regional economic and social interests diminished.

Nevertheless, for 20 years before the 1960s, proponents of federal involvement in education had been thwarted by three obstacles: localism and resistance of federal control of educational policymaking; divided opinion (political and constitutional) on aid to private, often church-related schools; and southern resistance to school desegregation requirements in post-war federal aid proposals.[1]

It took a remarkable conjunction of forces, mostly from outside the schools, to overcome these obstacles in 1965 and establish a distinct if limited federal role in elementary and secondary education. It is worth listing these conjoined forces, since their persistence or transformation have been and will be important determinants of federal educational policy. They were:

- A demographic explosion, pushing the numbers of school age children from a relatively constant 28 million (a level which had persisted from 1930 to 1950) to 42 million in 1960.
- Dramatic increases in the quality and quantity of education demanded per child. Parents with more education themselves sought expensive educational improvements for their children (especially small-classes and "modern" curricula) and society strove successfully to keep every student in school for more years. Between 1950 and 1960 alone, the average educational attainment of the adult population climbed 9.3 to 10.5 years of schooling[2] and total school spending tripled.[3]
- Equally dramatic increases in public support for civil rights and equal opportunity programs.
- National economic policy that focused on the rewards of economic growth and the contribution thereunto of productive educated persons.
- Reportedly hopeful prospects for additional financial resources from existing federal taxes, compared to state and local revenue sources.[4]

In 1964 and 1965, President Johnson and his domestic policy advisors took three giant steps that ended with the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

- They enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and in the process wiped out the long standing desegregation barrier to federal education aid.
- They inaugurated the War on Poverty with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and in the process provided a powerful new rationale for federal education aid-equal educational opportunity.
- They pieced together a fragile coalition of education interest groups supporting a package of four specific grant programs--which provided limited benefits to each important group--states, localities, educational reformers, private schools, and disadvantaged children.

These events created the present federal role in elementary and secondary education. But, federal education policymaking has not since ceased. Through extensive legislative activity (in 1966, 1967, 1968, 1970, and 1974), programs have been added, modified, consolidated, and occasionally dropped; and each year since 1967 education appropriations have been the topic of political contention; but the shape of the basic settlement has not changed.

Federal education programs seem, by and large, to serve five distinct purposes:

1. Promoting equal educational opportunity.

This ill-defined value is the most pervasive theme of federal education policy. Its most obvious expression is found in several grant-in-aid programs: each one designates a target group of students who are (by some yardstick) not adequately served by state and local programs. One or more categorical grants target federal resources at each of them. Year in and year out more than half of federal elementary and secondary education dollars are devoted to this objective. Title I of ESEA, delivering grants to most local school districts for education programs aimed at several million low income students, accounts for most of these resources--over $2 billion per year. Since 1965, Title I has been joined by smaller programs designed to target educational resources on the handicapped (1966), bilingual (1970), and American Indian (1972) students. These programs have not had the scope of Title I in terms of dollars spent, districts affected, or proportion of eligible children served. But, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 calls for a Title I-like federal commitment to that target group by 1982.

A more modest element of the equal educational opportunity program has focused on federal assistance for school districts undergoing racial desegregation of their schools. Such

assistance began on a small scale under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; since 1970, under Emergency School Assistance legislation, it has expanded to a quarter billion dollars per year in project grants.

2. Stimulating educational reforms.

In the mid-1960's, American education was in the midst of a wave of educational reform. Most aspects of the curriculum, pedagogy, socialization functions and management of American schools were coming under criticism--which was accompanied or swiftly followed by multiple proposals for tune-up or overhaul. Not surprisingly, Federal education programs have reflected this process. Unhappily, the federal programs have also shared in the vicissitudes of these reform efforts--rapid shifts in their popularity and credibility, as the hey days of team teaching, individualization, new science curricula, behavior modification, management by objectives, inquiry learning, alternative schooling, aesthetic and moral education, career education, and basic skills swiftly come and often go.

Typically, working either through the state Department of Education or directly with the local school district or other educational institutions, the federal government funds a specific "innovative" local project for a limited period of time: the idea being either to foster locally selected improvements or to subsidize a local focus on particular nationally perceived problems. The first and largest of these programs was Title III of ESEA, which left the districts to choose the focus of the project and the states to approve. In subsequent federal programs, the focus has been more on a specific federal substantive goal, like equal educational opportunity and specific federal approval for projects. The successive areas of federal interest have included:

- o teacher training projects (including Teacher Corps) in colleges and in school systems
- o extended nationwide development of projects in:
  - — innovative compensatory education
  - — exemplary vocational and career education
  - — several new special education delivery strategies
  - — reading improvement programs

- skimpily funded special action projects in several areas; drug abuse, environmental education; women's equity; metric conversion; community use of schools; ethnic heritage studies; and so forth.

All these programs account for a modest proportion of total federal education resources--usually less than $300 million per year.

For any given program, the federal resources subsidize a few or a few score of projects rationed among the thousands of eligible school districts and institutions according to geography, population, or relative need. The idea has been that each strategically placed demonstration will be observed and adopted by many other institutions.

With their vague objectives and necessarily arbitrary criteria for selection and performance, these programs have suffered more than their share of management problems at each level of government. They have often only marginal connection to local educational operations. The hoped for "demonstration effect" has rarely been observed.

Recently, some of these programs have been successfully tagged for consolidation (as in the case of Title III of ESEA and several vocation education project grant programs) and even for elimination (as with teacher training grants under the Education Professions Development Act).

Related to these reform-minded project grants have been continuing federal efforts to improve state and local planning and management of education. Through Title V of ESEA and through administrative set-asides in the several grants programs, the federal government has extensively subsidized state management of both federal and state programs (to the extent that half or more of the employees of many state agencies are today federally supported). Moreover, through the management strategies of several of the project grant programs, through the evaluation requirements in most federal educational legislation, and through sheer rhetorical persistence, the federal government

has also played a major role in propagating the family of rational policy management reforms variously termed "needs assessment," "comprehensive planning," and "accountability."[5]

3. Supporting educational research.

In education, as in many areas of national interest (like defense, medical science, agriculture, etc.), the federal government supports a large share of the nation's sponsored research. The federal government began its education program with statistics-gathering in 1867; it began sponsoring educational research in the 1950s. The increasingly national character of many educational problems and the cost of modern scientific research have dictated a major federal responsibility for such research. This emerging responsibility was emphasized by the establishment of the National Institute of Education in 1972. Smaller research programs concentrating on vocational education and special education also persist in the Office of Education. These research programs expend about $100 million per year.

4. Promoting educational preparation for employment.

The federal government has been especially responsible, since 1917, for the promotion of vocational education in the nation's schools. The schools' potential contribution to economic productivity was thus the first, and for a long time only, expressed national interest in education. Over the years, federal subsidies and regulations have established a veritable national subsystem of vocational education. From initially modest levels, federal appropriations have grown to over $600 million per year. During the past decade, there have been substantial reforms in vocational education--including attempts to focus vocational programs on disadvantaged and handicapped students, and to expand work-study and cooperative education programs. Lately through the career education strategy, the federal government has also tried to infuse all aspects of elementary and secondary education with a vocational perspective.

5. Providing limited general support.

The federal government has consistently declined to furnish general financial support for elementary and secondary schooling. In recent years, the push for such aid has been reinforced by the support of school finance reformers[6] who have linked such aid to equal opportunity considerations, like those undergirding the state-local reform movement. To date, though, such proposals have not received serious legislative consideration. Federal action has been precluded (among other things) by the costs of significant levels of support (say, $25 billion for a one-third share), by the fear of federal control of education, by suspicions that massive federal dollars would inflate teacher salaries without purchasing extra services and by concern that private and church school opposition to general aid (based on the fear that such aid to public schools would spell their demise) would bring unstuck the political basis for current federal education aid. So far, the federal interest in general purpose finance has been, in effect

- the authorization of small planning grants to state-level school finance equalization reforms
- the continuation of impacted areas aid, which is general support to those school districts affected by the presence of federal installations or employees--*and* the reform of that aid to allow its incorporation into reformed state finance systems
- the consolidation of several subsidies for the purchase of school library and instructional equipment, into a program of virtually unrestricted aid to local school districts.

Concealed in these neat distinctions is a considerable confusion about what the federal role is or should be. To some observers, the recent history of federal education policy is a dreary story of a succession of interest groups seeking "hunting licenses" (i.e., authorizing legislation) to bag federal resources; the dozens of programs represent no particular conception of the federal role, but simply a scorecard in these appropriations sweepstakes.[7]

PERSISTENT ISSUES IN FEDERAL EDUCATION POLICY, 1965-1976

Even though the dimensions (if any) of the federal role have changed little in the past decade, federal educational policymaking has remained a spirited pastime. Much of the policy debate has concerned two related issues: education's position in national social policy and the management of federal education programs in the intergovernmental system.

Education and Social Policy

The course of federal social policy can be traced in two obvious ways: legislation enacted and budgets approved. By both of these measures, elementary and secondary education has not enjoyed the highest priority among federal social programs (even during a time when domestic expenditures in general were taking a consistently rising share of federal resources, vis-a-vis defense spending[8]).

As noted earlier, only an unusual conjunction of forces allowed for the inauguration of a substantial federal aid program in the first place. The ESEA was hardly enacted when this momentum began to fade. Along with OEO, Model Cities, and manpower training (but unlike medicare), ESEA was part of the anti-poverty focus of the Great Society; and it was hurt when the Poverty War was displaced by the Vietnam War. Even in the early years of ESEA (fiscal years 1967 and 1968), appropriations were unexpectedly lean as guns thinned out butter in Johnson Administration budgets. Moreover, the Coleman Report on Equal Educational Opportunity and the early evaluations of Head Start and Title I raised doubts among federal policy analysts about the effectiveness of educational interventions in general, and federal intervention in particular, for alleviating poverty and its effects. Among these social policy planners, attention soon shifted to the potential benefits of better income maintenance programs--where poverty could, it seemed, be more directly alleviated by federal action.

With the arrival of the Nixon Administration, the revised, lowered priority for federal education was reinforced. The new administration did not (as was feared) try to reopen the question of whether or not there ought to be federal aid to education. But it was openly skeptical of the effectiveness of the federal educational programs. It also

wanted to limit federal social programs generally, and the extent of central control over them. Its social policy proposals featured budget restraint and New Federalism. Its domestic priorities were general revenue sharing and welfare reform. Its budgetary imperatives stemmed mainly from the swift growth and escalating costs of the federal obligation for income support and health financing. Targets for administrative improvement, decentralization or demise were the Great Society grant-in-aid programs--which it believed were prolific, duplicative, and ineffective. Of these, elementary and secondary education programs were Prime Examples. Thus, education budget requests remained low, relative to legislative authority--usually at the nominal dollar levels of previous years. Few new programs were proposed; many of the existing programs were slated for consolidation and special revenue sharing with the states.

In Congress, the situation was a bit different. There were no serious attempts to enact large new elementary and secondary programs; but neither was there a willingness to shift priorities so quickly. Congress's impulse was to oversee and amend existing programs, to legislate small new programs without disturbing the contours of federal elementary and secondary education policy, and to keep aggregate funding levels at about the same real level of purchasing power, year to year.* But, like the Nixon Administration, its main priorities for new social

---

*In this annual process of trying to pull Presidential budget requests moderately upward, the "education lobby" has had limited but distinct effect. This "lobby" consists of several hundred specialized groups whose interests differ and whose Washington activities have historically been limited to small staffs with dominantly professional concerns. Their dealings with Congress were often hampered by fears of losing their nonprofit tax-exempt status.[9] They were pulled together, not by one of their own, but by the Johnson Administration, to support the passage of ESEA itself. In the Committee on Full Funding, several of the largest have, through "least common denominator" bargaining, joined together to secure modest Congressional increases (8-10% per year) over administration budget requests in education. But they have not, in contrast, secured serious consideration, let alone passage, for their long-standing request for larger-scale general financial aid to schools.

programs and added federal resources lay elsewhere: improved Social Security benefits, expanded food stamp programs, and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for the elderly poor. Its most ambitious ventures into new education policy occurred in *higher* education, with the enactment of the Education Amendments of 1972.

All in all, in the decade since 1965, elementary and secondary education programs have struggled to retain their modest but definite place in federal social policy. Indeed, during recent years, there has developed considerable sentiment for all levels of government to ratify this emerging division of social policy responsibilities: to agree that the federal government should shoulder the responsibility for economic stabilization, income security, and health insurance while state governments accept greater responsibility for the support of education.

Managing Federal Programs in the Intergovernmental System

In promoting ESEA, the federal government promised to remain a "junior partner" in education policy and all federal legislation pays homage to local control, pledging that no provision of the legislation "should be construed to authorize any department, agency, office or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any education institution, school or school system."

Needless to say, reality has been more complicated than this. First of all, the federal government never decided to whom it should be junior partner, the states or the LEAs. Sometimes a program was designed to deal primarily with one; and sometimes with the other. Then, too, the same federal laws which adjured control sometimes required parent involvement, for instance, or acceptable instruction programs, or comparability of local expenditures as a condition for receiving federal aid. Moreover, the federal program managers developed additional guidelines for program management, elaborate program reporting requirements, and extensive program evaluations--often with Congressional encouragement. Needless to say, no one has been happy with the outcomes. Federal officials complain about a lack of state and local compliance with federal requirements. States complain about senseless federal requirements. Locals complain about this too, and also about senseless state

requirements. In part, the argument is simply a matter of power and influence, where each successive level of government wants more resources and less direction from the ones above it. But, there is also a legitimate question of program effectiveness: How will desired redistributions and reforms be best achieved, through careful federal direction of state and local effort or through state/local adaptation of federal priorities to local needs and practices.[10] The states especially have persisted since 1965 in efforts to gain greater control of federal programs. They were successful right off the bat in 1967, capturing greater authority over Title III, recent proposals for revenue sharing and grant consolidation would enhance their authority much more. But most Congressmen and target group spokesmen remain mindful that federal categorical programs were invented in the first place because state and local performance had been inadequate in the various areas of national concern. So far, the categorical structure of federal aid persists, especially with respect to programs aimed at national target groups. Modest consolidations have been achieved in grants to states for innovative and institutional support programs.

In the midst of this intergovernmental clatter, federal program officials must implement and manage the federal education programs. Constrained by the federal-state-local rivalries, they must still be concerned with the distribution of the federal financial resources, with the implementation of the federally-supported activities, and ultimately with their program's effectiveness in improving educational processes and outcomes. Federal program management has been challenged on all sides: for trying to control local operations too much, on the one hand, and for failing to produce substantial and effective local projects that reflect the federal intent, on the other; for bothering recipients with financial reporting requirements and for letting recipients misuse federal funds; for proposing onerous evaluation requirements, and for not knowing whether the federal programs work. As presently conceived, the job of federal program management is probably impossible. The federal managers cannot succeed until the contending powers in the educational system sit down and agree upon what functions they should and should not perform.

Withal, the federal programs have some achievements to their credit. They do reasonably well at distributing extra resources toward needy individuals and school districts;[11] notwithstanding a rising chorus of boo's, they have stimulated some substantial changes in the decisionmaking processes and employment practices of state and local education agencies; and they have sometimes produced limited, but distinct, improvements in student performance.[12] The most significant federal program impact may lie, however, in a fuzzy realm called "leadership" or "opinion-making," to the extent that the federal government may have changed the priorities and behavior of the entire educational system through its rhetorical as well as programmatic emphases on equal educational opportunity, career education, accountability, and so forth.[13]

EMERGING ISSUES IN FEDERAL EDUCATION POLICY

In recent years, the political intensity surrounding federal education issues has begun to subside. There are no longer serious arguments about whether or not there ought to be a federal role, or about open-and-shut questions like whether federal programs are effective or ineffective. It is likely that budget levels will be somewhat more generous for existing programs; but large new program initiatives are less likely. Issues concerning the focus and quality of program and resource management dominate what policy debate there is, and will probably continue to do so.

Some Trends and Forecasts

We have suggested previously that the overall significance and specific priorities of federal educational policy derived in part from national demographic and economic trends, legal acquirements, and public attitudes toward education--noting that each of these factors pushed toward federal involvement in the 1960s. Which way are they likely to draw education policy in the late 1970s and 1980s?

a. Demography. Elementary and secondary school enrollments have dipped from 51 to 49 million between 1970 and 1975 and will decline by another 4 million (or roughly 8 percent) by 1980. After that, they will remain relatively stable. Moreover,

average educational attainment levels will probably remain stable (i.e., 75-80 percent of each age cohort will complete high school). In probable consequence, local school districts will face serious problems in the "management of decline": utilization and consolidation of school buildings; personnel management in an era of fewer teachers who may be older and will more likely be collectively organized; control of relatively fixed costs in administrative and support services; and political difficulty in retaining recently developed special programs for needy students. The educational community will constitute a diminishing proportion of the taxpayers *and* of the service clientele in many jurisdictions. Many of the older urban school districts will continue to constitute a special case: fewer pupils, but more racially isolated, economically disadvantaged and educationally needy; higher costs for both basic and special programs; a stagnant tax base and fairly hostile state legislative majorities. At each level of government, relatively greater demand will exist for services (including, but not limited to, education) and subsidies benefiting the relatively larger numbers of adults.

b. National Economic and Budgetary Conditions. If national economic recovery continues, without renewed inflation, then governmental revenues should once again be adequate for program maintenance--educational and otherwise. At the state level, funding levels for education support have increased right up to the present.[14] At the national level, even assuming economic recovery, there will be fiscal flexibility for only a few major initiatives over the next few years, once present obligations are met; and by every current indication, programs of economic stimulus, welfare reform and national health insurance will remain at the top of the list of likely initiatives. In the labor market, high school and college graduates as well as women reentering the labor market will continue to face fairly hard going in terms of jobs and salaries, at least until the labor market adjusts to the entry of recent large cohorts of youth.[15]

c. Costs of Education. Slack demand will probably keep teachers' salary settlements at or below cost-of-living increases. Stable or declining enrollments will keep aggregate cost increases (especially for capital expansion) down, but unit costs may still climb sharply because of fixed costs and inefficiency. Judicial or Congressional mandates (e.g., for special education) are the most likely source of new cost pressures.

d. Attitudes towards Support for Schooling. It is unlikely that the majority of parents will return to earlier attitudes demanding expensive qualitative improvements in schooling. Social problems like school discipline and desegregation have for several years been as much on parents' minds as issues of school finance or educational quality.[16] Declining test scores, whatever their real meaning, are alarming to the public. Disillusionment with recent educational reforms seems to be growing; and some considerable skepticism and ideological hostility towards public institutions, including schools, may be a permanent side-effect of a highly educated citizenry.

e. Interest Group Influence. Two among the sets of interest groups may increase their influence in federal education policy: (1) state legislators, governors, mayors and other elected general government officials; and especially (2) organized teachers in the NEA and AFT. The teachers, in particular, have played an unprecedented, positive political role in successful Presidential and Congressional campaigns. They may provide a new concentration of effective political influence in Washington. At the same time, though, they may remain at logger-heads with state and local bargaining adversaries and suspect in the eyes of wary taxpayers.

If the future unfolds as described, educational policymaking will focus heavily on state level activity aimed at helping local education agencies to retrieve public confidence and manage decline. The relatively new state and local programs focusing on equity and innovation will do

well to hold their own. Program expansion opportunities will be extremely limited, confined to a few still overlooked or underserved clienteles: pre-schoolers, handicapped students, and adults.

At the federal level, pressures for program expansion may concentrate on these same groups. Sentiment for large-scale general aid will remain moderate. The federal government may be looked to even more than in the past to insure equity for high cost target groups, to assist financially pressed urban school districts, and to stimulate improved educational practice. In addition, organized teachers and other interest groups may press for national solutions to pervasive issues of indirect but substantial interest to education, like public employee bargaining rights and pension portability. On the other hand, state/local satisfaction of federal program priorities may become an ever more difficult problems, unless there is (a) intergovernmental clarification of educational roles and missions, and (b) improved design and management of federal grants programs.

II. IMPLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POLICY DEVELOPMENTS FOR TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

The remainder of this paper sets forth illustrative and perhaps provacative suggestions for courses of action which developments in federal education policy might suggest to institutions which train teachers. Obviously, federal programs devoted exclusively to the preparation of teachers have, so far, played only a modest part in federal education policy; they may have, as history would have it, suffered more than their share of ill-fortune, when teacher shortage turned to teacher surplus and when the Educational Renewal strategy of 1972 became part of the Nixon Administration's credibility gap with Congress. The future need not hold such bad luck as the past, and it could allow professional development programs to regain a modest position in the repertoire of federal program initiatives. In this process, however, it might be a mistake to concentrate too much on seeking additional short-run benefits within a narrow range of federal educational programs. This might simply pit the modes of teacher training against one another. What may be suggested instead is a broader and longer run strategy which would place professional development enterprises more in

tune with, and even (may the gods so smile upon us) in anticipation of, federal program priorities. Thus, I would urge that you notice the changing context of federal education policy, that you notice the seemingly enduring national priorities which are embodied in the federal education programs, that you notice the kinds of problems the federal programs encounter in their development and implementation, and only lastly, that you notice the additional resources which the federal government may be able to shower upon you. The rationale for these suggestions goes as follows:

1. The external trends which affect federal education policy also affect several nationally significant aspects of teacher training activity.

- The substantial decline in student enrollments and elementary and secondary schools has begun to produce, along with the teacher surplus, a reduced turnover in existing school staffs. This has led, obviously, to additional focus on retraining rather than pre-training needs. Obviously, this development vexes schools of education greatly. Not only are their enrollments down, but the nature of the training demanded is changing--toward inservice but often *away from* the course credit offerings which assured progress through the teachers' salary lanes, as well as progress into administrative positions. Instead, local officials and teachers are seeking specific inservice training opportunities keyed to their own policy priorities. And they are doing so with lean and sometimes reduced budgets, so that new training needs are often financed out of existing staff development resources. There is probably no greater challenge for the institutions represented here than the decision of whether to protect the benefits which flow from the established arrangements for course credit offerings or to seek out the less certain rewards of responsiveness to local district needs. The problem involves many crucial aspects of

institutional performance: faculty skills and interests, relationships with state and local educational authorities, and standards of teacher certification, especially for specialized teaching skills.

- Even while this adjustment goes forward, however, the colleges of education must look forward to the mid-1980s, when elementary and secondary enrollments will level off. If, during these ten years of teacher surplus, the rate of enrollments in the colleges of education has declined and remains very low, and if most of the members of the "reserve pool" of trained teachers have moved to other careers, then teacher surplus may turn swiftly into a teacher shortage which would, because of the lag involved in stimulating new college of education enrollments, take the better part of another decade to correct.[17] If the colleges of education are to get off this long-term rollercoaster ride, they must begin (as they did not the last time around) advanced planning to keep teacher supply in some kind of balance with teacher demand. This, too, is a tricky maneuver and one which must avoid perpetuation of the *status quo* in present teacher ratio as an element of national education planning.
- If the individual economic returns from education, in the form of jobs and wages, remain as modest as the economists predict, then the public schools will continue to face pressure from parents and students, as well as from employers, for more effective career preparation components in elementary and secondary curricula. This will rub against the grain of many educators, but it will not go away. In these circumstances, professional educators will have to learn how to satisfy part of this demand. Even more importantly, perhaps, they will need to understand what aspects of adult economic performances the schools can and cannot be responsible for, so that the schools and teachers do not promise what they cannot produce.

- Perhaps the easiest lesson of the demographic data is that the demands for additional education services may be concentrated in the early childhood sector (where many are unserved) and in the adult sector (where there will be relatively more prospective students who may demand more education in order to inch ahead of their colleagues in the job competition which the future may hold).

2. The educational problems of national legislative concern should become the continuing prominent concern of teacher training institutions.

- Federal programs for compensatory education, vocational education, bilingual and Indian education, and special education for the handicapped--as well as programs to facilitate school desegregation--are here to stay and they will probably grow. They and the growing number of counterpart programs financed by state and local governments will generate an important part of the demand for new teaching skills within the profession. As we have just seen, other demands for teacher preparation will be slight, and some existing resources for continuing teacher education may be eyed enviously by others. It takes a good deal of basic political appeal for the national legislature to override traditions of state and local control and establish a continuing program of federal intervention in the educational system. Where such programs persist, I would suggest they represent a rather basic national commitment and teacher training institutions might do well to view them that way and seek new means for participating in them. The example of special education is currently most pertinent. The full implementation of the new federal legislation for the education of all handicapped children would generate tremendous demands for the instruction of teachers. Teachers will need, among other things, general orientation to the educational

needs of the exceptional child, skills in pupil evaluation, and the construction of individualized program plans for each student. They will also need to understand the implications of a least restrictive environment of exceptional children upon their classroom teaching practices. Moreover, vocational education teachers will need to know more about how to provide their services to handicapped children.[18] All this is in addition naturally to the additional numbers of special education teachers which would be required to provide an appropriate education for every handicapped child. The impact of full implementation of P.L. 94-142 (which would generate an estimated $12 billion in additional federal, state, and local expenditures) should have a pervasive impact on most schools of education, not just on their special education departments.

- It is crucial that the education profession understand and accept the priority (substantial but not supreme) which education holds in federal domestic policies; and that it understand and cooperate in the programmatic connections between education and such other social policy functions such as income security, health services and family service programs. This will mean the further dimunition or professional isolation. It is a move which is called for not simply by considerations of effective service delivery, but also by the political necessity, during a time when education's public will be a relatively smaller proportion of the voting populace, to forge into new broad political alliances. Only then will the schools' vulnerability to such phenomena as the recent recession-induced taxpayer's revolt be minimized over the long pull.

3. Problem areas in the performance of the educational system, which intrude upon the development and management of federal programs will often imply changes in the agenda of teacher training institutions.

- Teacher trainees should understand the nature of the organized, segmented profession they are about to join. Nowadays, there are only limited areas in the educational performance in which teachers and administrators function in a unified way, without regard to their status of employees and employers. The organized teaching profession has arrived, rightfully, after a long history in which teachers were underpaid and often pushed around. There are in collective bargaining both constraints and opportunities for teachers, the risk of a loss of professionalism and the opportunity to regain it through new collegial enterprises. At the least, these are matters which an institution of teacher preparation should give its students the opportunity to consider fully during their training.
- Teachers must learn how to function in educational systems which insist upon accountability from their professionals. Teachers will not rush to embrace accountability, and they should rightly resist it when the proposed measures of their performance are inappropriate or distort the educational process, or where the standards of progress are impossible to achieve; but the burden of public disillusionment lies upon them and has been reinforced, rightly or wrongly, by their organizing to bargain collectively. Teachers can especially not refuse to participate in the educational planning aspects of the accountability prospects. There, they may achieve both appropriate performance measures and some greater say so in educational decisions. They may, in the process, both retrieve some lost professional status and acquire some new professional norms. These, however, are difficult tasks for which their formal training ought to prepare them.
- Teachers should understand the necessary components of successful planned change in their school. Too often in the recent past, outside interventions into the school (many of which were federally financed) have been thrust upon the teacher in a

top-down fashion and teachers have often resisted such intrusions. Policymakers are slowly learning the painful truth about successful program implementation, that it requires a patient process of mutual adaptation between the proposed innovation and the local setting.[19] Teachers should learn this lesson, too, and they reportedly do not.[20]

- Teachers should have the resources to interpret and utilize the results of educational research. It is ironic, of course, that so much of the educational research performed in the schools of education has been of so little utility to the alumni and alumnae of those schools in the classrooms. Thus, much of the problem in the utilization of research lies in its relevance and interpretability but some of the problem also lies in teachers' inability to locate and adapt research findings to their classroom systems. This shortcoming may be less serious when there is little pertinent research to understand, but it may become more serious if NIE's research into basic skill performance and the effectiveness of teaching produce valuable clues for the world of educational practice.

4. Finally, federal program resources do offer specific opportunity for teacher training institutions to extend and improve their programs. In this regard, let us consider the existing and emerging federal programs as examples of the problems and opportunities ahead.

- The newly legislated teacher center program is an obvious example of the new influence of the organized teaching profession to capture both resources and substantial control thereof. The Carter Administration's revised budget proposes $5 million for these centers. The schools of education failed in efforts to gain alternative support for graduate training. They garnered only minority representation on the boards of

these centers, but they are not excluded. The opportunity exists to cooperate and help inform the paths which the teacher organizations have chosen for subsidized improvement of their teaching skills. If the opportunity is seized, both the teacher centers themselves and the participating institutions will be strengthened.

- The Teacher Corps has the singular virtue of being that professional development program which has concentrated unremittingly upon the national priority of educating disadvantaged students, but which has adjusted successfully to the emerging retraining requirements and tried earnestly to become a more well engineered bridge from the participating colleges of education to the host LEA's. The Teacher Corps still has to struggle with the problem of high cost per graduate and with its effectiveness in spreading improved educational practice beyond its project boundaries. But does it not offer in its most current incarnation a model of the ways in which colleges of education might be connected over extended periods of time with intensive efforts to improve professional performance with respect to the stated national priorities, not just of the disadvantaged but also of the bilingual, the native American, the handicapped student, and the student in need of career education? Teacher Corps has already taken some steps in these directions. Such a strategy might, properly designed, within or alongside of Teacher Corps complement the progress of teacher centers by providing them with new input on the ever emerging problems of national educational concern.

These two models are the best two to start with. They exist. Except in the service of specific federal priorities like special and bilingual education, programs of direct aid to schools of education do not exist and are not likely to. And they might not be healthy for you anyhow: direct dependence on the federal government is a less stable and probably

less vital arrangement, *vis-a-vis* the federal government, than the development of an acknowledged and necessary role in the efforts of local educators to satisfy national educational priorities.

What I have outlined above are a series of difficult but worthy challenges for the schools of education. Each offers some chance of the schools taking a more prominent place eventually in the development and execution of federal education policies. In all candor, I think the task is a very difficult one and that its successful execution may elude us all. Involved, after all, are some enormous adjustments in internal performance as well as in relationships with state and local governments and with teacher organizations. If the execution is successful, the outcome will be a secure but not exactly over-sized niche for the university-based programs of professional development in education.

NOTES

1. John F. Jennings, "Federal General Aid - Likely or Illusory," Journal of Law and Education, Vol. 2, No. 1 (January 1973), pp. 89ff.

2. National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education (1976 edition) (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976), p. 8.

3. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1973 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974), p. 35.

4. See, for example, Walter W. Heller, New Dimensions of Political Economy (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 117ff.

5. Michael Kirst and Gail Bass, Accountability: What is the Federal Role? (Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1976).

6. See, for example, Joel Berke and Michael Kirst, Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? Who Governs? (New York: Lexington Books, 1972).

7. See, for instance, Samuel Halperin in Robert Andringa, et al., Perspectives on Federal Educational Policy: An Informal Colloquium (Washington: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1976), p. 1.

8. Edward R. Fried et al., Setting National Priorities: The 1974 Budget (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1973).

9. Stephen K. Bailey, Education Interest Groups in the Nation's Capital (Washington: American Council on Education, 1975).

10. Harry L. Summerfield, Power and Process (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974).

11. Berke and Kirst, op. cit., Alan L. Ginsburg and J. Neal Killelea, Patterns of Federal Aid to School Districts, DHEW/ASPE Technical Analysis Paper, February 1975.

12. For the most recent evidence on effectiveness, see USOE/OPBE, "A Study of Compensatory Reading Programs," September 1976, and Thomas C. Thomas and Sol H. Pelavin, Patterns of ESEA Title I Reading Achievement (Menlo Park: SRI, 1976).

13. See, for instance, Samuel Halperin, "ESEA: . . . The Positive Side," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 57, No. 3, November 1975, pp. 147-156.

14. DHEW/NCES, Condition of Education, 1976 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976), p. 189.

15. Richard Freeman, "The Declining Economic Value of Higher Education and the American Social System," Aspen Institute Program for Education in a Changing Society, 1976.

16. DHEW/NCES, Condition of Education, 1976 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976), p. 52.

17. Peter A. Morrison, "The Demographic Context of Education Policy Planning," An Occasional Paper of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies Program on Education for a Changing Society, 1976, pp. 10-12.

18. Winifred I. Warsat, "Implications of the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act for Inservice Training," Paper presented to the OECD Forum of Education Organization Leaders, January 1977.

19. Paul Berman and Milbrey McLaughlin, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, 5 Vols., Rand Corporation, R-1589-HEW, 1975.

20. Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher (University of Chicago Press, 1975).